

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance are requested of Claims 22, 23, 31, 32, 36 and 61 which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 22 (and 23, 31, 32 and 36 dependent thereon) and Claim 61 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner and are submitted as now satisfying the requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112. Since these Claims 22, 23, 31, 32, 36 and 61 were indicated by the Examiner to be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the §112 rejection, allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 1, 18 and 19 which were also rejected on the grounds of indefiniteness have been rewritten as new Claims 64, 65 and 66 respectively, and in rewriting these claims the indefiniteness has been corrected. Claim 9 has been canceled. Since Claims 1, 18 and 19 were also rejected on prior art, it is submitted that the rewritten Claims 64, 65 and 66 are allowable over the prior art as discussed below.


Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ackley. Consideration and allowance of new Claim 64 (rewritten Claim 1) is requested because it recites novel and nonobvious subject matter over Ackley for the following reasons. In Ackley, the two points which determine the steering axis of the front wheel are rigidly connected, and the steering head is fixed to the swing arm so that the entire steering head and thus the entire steering axis moves. In Applicant's claimed invention, the two bearing points which determine the steering axis are not connected rigidly and they thus provide a variable position in the steering axis.

Claims 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bynoe. Claims 18 and 19 have been rewritten as new Claims 65 and 66, and these claim are submitted as being allowable over Bynoe for the following reasons. Although Bynoe shows a three part fork, all the parts are not slidable into each other. In Bynoe, only the middle part 22 is slidable relative to parts 20 and 24, but part 24 is permanently fixed to part 20 through stem 32. Thus, this is not a telescopic fork as Bynoe does not allow the front wheel to move against the upper frame. In Applicant's invention as recited in Claims 65 and 66, the three connection elements are each slidable into the adjacent element to provide a true telescopic fork allowing relative suspension functions of the front wheel to the frame of the vehicle. Claim 66 in addition recites springs that support each connecting element.

Although Claims 24-30, 33-35, 37-42, 52-60 and 62-63 were withdrawn as being drawn to nonelected species, these claims are all dependent upon one of more of Claims 22, 23, 31, 32, 36 and 61 which have been indicated by Examiner to be allowable, and therefore allowance of these claims is respectfully requested in this application.

Respectfully submitted,

MARTIN F. WIMMER

By:   
James C. Nemmers  
Attorney for Applicants

James C. Nemmers  
Shuttleworth & Ingersoll, PLC  
115 3<sup>rd</sup> Street SE, Suite 500  
P.O. Box 2107  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52406  
Phone: (319) 365-9461  
Fax: (319) 365-8443  
Email: jcn@shuttleworthlaw.com  
Reg. No.: 19,143  
October 4, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 10-4-05



James C. Nemmers, Registered Representative